

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

CHARLES HOLBROOK,

Petitioner,

v.

Case Number 2:17-cv-13081

HONORABLE DENISE PAGE HOOD

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ERICK BALCARCEL,

Respondent,

_____ /

**OPINION AND ORDER DENYING THE PETITIONS/LETTERS
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Petitioner, Charles Holbrook, filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, in which he challenged his state court convictions for two counts of producing child sexually abusive material, two counts of allowing a child to engage in child sexually abusive activity, two counts of possessing child sexual abusive material, accosting a child for immoral purposes, felon in possession of a firearm, and being a third felony habitual offender. Because petitioner had challenged these convictions in a prior habeas petition, this Court ordered that the case be transferred to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit for

authorization to file a successive habeas petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A). (ECF No. 3) The Sixth Circuit denied his request to file a successive habeas petition, noting that Petitioner has filed numerous federal habeas petitions and that the Sixth Circuit has denied his motions on multiple occasions. *See In re Holbrook*, U.S.C.A. No. 17-2242, ECF No. 22). Petitioner has now filed several new petitions/letters, which the Court construes are motions for reconsideration of the Court's previous opinion and order and the Sixth Circuit's order. For the reasons that follow, the petitions/motions are DENIED.

The Court denies petitioner's petitions/letters for reconsideration, because the Sixth Circuit denied Petitioner's request for permission to file a second or successive petition. In addition, Petitioner is not entitled to reconsideration of the Court's orders. A motion for reconsideration is not a vehicle to re-hash old arguments, or to proffer new arguments or evidence that the movant could have brought up earlier. *Sault Ste. Marie Tribe v. Engler*, 146 F.3d 367, 374 (6th Cir. 1998)(motions under Fed.R.Civ.P. 59(e) "are aimed at re consideration, not initial consideration")(citing *FDIC v. World Universal Inc.*, 978 F.2d 10, 16 (1st Cir.1992)).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petitions/letters requesting for relief and/or for reconsideration (ECF Nos. 30-37) are **DENIED**.

s/Denise Page Hood

HON. DENISE PAGE HOOD

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

DATED: May 4, 2021